

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 93 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #240
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 20 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 240

Today's Topics:

ARRL policymaking (2 msgs)
Call sign snobbery (2 msgs)

Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams) (2 msgs)
Order pizza on your autopatch now (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 19 Jul 93 23:12:43 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL policymaking
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>I deny none of that. Nor is it at issue. Tony claims that the ARRL
>position went against the wishes of the membership. I assert that the
>Board believed that the membership did not want no-code in 1983, and
>that they believed the membership *did* want no-code in 1989.

How can the League make that determination? Was another poll of its membership conducted?

In January 1989, K1ZZ and W4RA started the cop-out: "As for the League's position, as always it will be determined by the Board of Directors that you members elect - a Board that has shown itself to be very responsive to members' desires." (OST, January 1989, Pg. 9)

How many Board members were elected between the time K1ZZ made this statement and the League ramed the no-code issue down its member's throats on August 21, 1989, when the ARRL filed their petition for codeless class of amateur license? How many members had an opportunity to choose their board members after asking the question "Do you support the creation of a no-code license class?"

I daresay few, if none at all. It was perfectly timed so that the membership would be at a disadvantage, and those Board members that did support the issue could easily be "scapegoats" for the membership, for the "good" of amateur radio. Translated: the ARRL acted upon its own accord, with little if any actual input from the membership (other than pro/con letters written), with the express purpose of, in my opinion, not furthering the cause of amateur radio, but augmenting the coffers of the ARRL. After all, let's not forget the goal K1ZZ stated in QST, January 1985: "By 1990: 600,000 Radio Amateurs".

>You are no doubt referring to the poll commissioned by the League's
>Long Range Planning Committee. That poll was in *1980.* What, pray
>tell, does that have to do with the League's position on no-code in
>1989?

Why didn't the ARRL feel it was necessary to commission another study of its members' wishes? I mean, hell, if the issue was so damn important to warrent a poll in 1980, why didn't it warrent another poll in 1989 to accurately determine if the opinions of the membership have changed on the issue? Certainly Mr. Wilson and his committee could have easily polled the membership and included the results of said poll in their report to the Board/members. Could it be that had another poll been conducted the ARRL would have found out that indeed a majority of its members did not support the concept of a "no-code" license, and thus the ARRL would be on very precarious footing by supporting such a license knowing full well how its members felt?

Furthermore, when the ARRL's No-Code Study Committee was formed, the CEO of AEA and Director of Marketing/Planning for Tandy were appointed. Why should VENDORS of amateur-radio supplies have input on ARRL decision-making policy? Oh, other than those QST advertising dollars, that is. To me, it reeks of conflict-of-interest. In fact, since every single one of those committee members, less W2GD and KOPP, who were representing the "general amateur community", were connected with an organization that had everything (translated: \$\$\$) to gain, and nothing to lose, from a no-code license, the entire scenario reeks of conflict-of-interest.

>My personal view is that policy making by poll is poor policy making.

However, we're not talking about a \$5k committee budget either.

>Whip away. You seem to have the facts correct, except that you've
>identified only *some* of the facts. Possibly because of this, you've
>drawn erroneous conclusions. Reread the 1989 material if you want to
>know what lay behind the League's support of no-code.

I'm stareing at it right now. And, my conclusions are the same.

>Oh, by the way... I'm one of the amateurs who was against no-code in
>1983 and for it in 1989.

In many respects, I actually *like* the way the original concept behind
the no-code license was structured. I like the restrictions, and the
built-in incentive to upgrade.

>That opinion was
>reached not by scientific sampling, but by constituent contact.

The "consituent contact" that I've had with other folks on HF has been
overwhelmingly negative. Of course, I'd expect HF users to have a
skewed opinion. Could the "constituent contact" which you spoke of been
skewed as well? Did the thought ever cross someone's mind? Or, was the
ARRL thinking in terms of increased revenue from all those new memberships?

>but I very much doubt you have any
>data in hand that gives a better indication of how ARRL members felt
>about the no-code license in 1989--or at any other time.

Given a little more research time, I might find something. However, I
tend to doubt it, and I certainly can't reconstruct an accurate "poll"
today from opinions people had in the late 80's.

>2) that the League
>leadership knew it.

The League's approval of the Committee's proposal, as amended, by a vote
of 9-to-6, with the lead-in "insinuation" by K1ZZ that "if your board
members aren't representing your views, vote them out", is pretty clear
that some people thought they were treading on very thin ice.

MD

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 07:33:27 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: ARRL policymaking
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

[much drivel deleted for lack of relevance]

>The League's approval of the Committee's proposal, as amended, by a vote
>of 9-to-6, with the lead-in "insinuation" by K1ZZ that "if your board
>members aren't representing your views, vote them out", is pretty clear
>that some people thought they were treading on very thin ice.

So please, end the suspense, did the membership vote the board members out?
If the board's action was so reprehensible and opposed to the general
memberships views, how many were voted out?

Please stay tuned for more of "As the stomach turns: An endless tragedy
filled with inane arguments." Certainly nothing could be more interesting
than debating history.

This is even too much for rec.radio.amateur.policy. Take it to alt.flame.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 19 Jul 93 20:28:13 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, hayward@cs.uchicago.edu (Kristin Rachael Hayward)
writes:
><deleted stuff>
>
>Yes, that is exactly what it is: "call sign snobbery."
>
>Maybe it is even "call sign arrogance."

>
>Should we not judge hams on how they act on the air rather than on
>what class they are or how long they have had their license?
>
> Kristin Rachael Hayward
>
>--
>-----
>Kristin Rachael Hayward University of Maine WX9T
>kristin@gandalf.umcs.maine.edu (yes, I know I didn't post from there)
>

Call sign snobbery/arrogance isn't a recent phenomenon, as
those of us who had the "pleasure" of hearing W20Y on 75-
meter AM in the 60s will attest!

73, Jim, KR1S (ex-WB2EDW)

--
jkearman@arrl.org

Date: 19 Jul 93 16:13:26 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
>In article <CA7Fps.BKF@feenix.metronet.com> marchbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc
Grant) writes:
>>
>>But seriously folks, wouldn't you like to see them re-issue old calls?
>
> Not me! As my call distinguishes me as having had my license for quite a
>few years, it was bad enough when they started issuing 1x2s in the W9xx and
>K9xx category, making a guy with a two-year-old license sound like he'd been
>in ham radio for thirty years longer than I had; but hearing some 15-year-old
>signing "W90MR" or something like that would just break my spirit entirely.
> Which, I guess, is another form of callsign snobbery...

Well, I've known both old-time hams and recently minted hams who have
contributed mightily to the amateur community. Likewise, I've known
hams in those two groups who have contributed nothing discernable to
ham radio. Lacking any visible correlation between time licensed and
quality of participation, I've decided that if my 25 years in ham radio
mean anything, it's probably only that I'm getting old, crotchety and
set in my ways.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 23:44:19 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Why do I have a feeling that 20 years from now we'll still be debating inane issues of the no-code history and the only new hams will be on VHF/UHF repeaters. Not because they're too lazy to learn Morse code, but because they won't be allowed to have outdoor antennas. While we fight amongst ourselves, our undoing is likely to be in the making. I just hope Phase 3D and follow ons are as effective as they say, because the only DX many hams will be able to do is from a hand held.

Stop whining and arguing about the past and figure out how to save the future. We could learn a *lot* from the NRA.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 93 00:09:42 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!floyd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

{Message Deleted}

Naw Todd, people will still be on VHF/UHF for public service work. That's the entire reason I became a licensed amateur. I respected the public service work that the same 12 or 15 people in an area do time after time. You know, the reason we have frequencies. Yup, they're real nice for rag-chews, but if a disaster requiring RACES comes to town, I doubt there's going to be time for rag chews. In fact, I'd say VHF/UHF operations would probably restrictly strictly to offical traffic, from those 12 or 15 people who bothered to do something for the community.

With how obsolete HF is becoming with Sat. technology, I doubt they'd be too restricted, but certain areas would need to be set aside for nets, esp. as a backup to all the Sat. and Microwave technology. VHF/UHF won't ever be just newbies. It'll remain newbies, and the others in Amateur Radio who joined to give something back to the community, not just add a piece of equipment next to the CB and send cards to people after discussing nothing but the weather. I just hope I save these things I write on the computer.. I'd hate to become one of those hams in 20 years from now.. if I do I will remember to ship my license back, as others should have done.

73 de N8VUR Douglas A. Dever floyd@nraven.wariat.org

QSO on 444.600 or 146.520 Anytime!

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 93 15:29:42 EDT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!floyd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:

> Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal
> anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and
> abolish CW next :-(
>
> Dave
>

Naw! They'll move on from that and try to recall all the no-code
licenses! :)

Douglas A. Dever floyd@nraven.wariat.org

73 de N8VUR QSO on 446.000 anytime!

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 93 07:24:56 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:
: dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:

```
:> Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal
:> anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and
:> abolish CW next :-)
:>
:> Dave
:>
:
:> Naw! They'll move on from that and try to recall all the no-code
:> licenses! :)
:
:> Douglas A. Dever floyd@nraven.wariat.org
:
:> 73 de N8VUR QSO on 446.000 anytime!
```

I guess you guys didn't hear about that new petition going around, that wants to remove all 'phone from 160--10 meters, and have only CW .

Randy, KA1UNW

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 22:11:32 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!
nucsrl!ahab.eecs.nwu.edu!hpa@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <226ropINNhib@west.West.Sun.COM>, <1993Jul17.204406.1@levy.fnal.gov>, <1993Jul18.220944.106865@locus.com>cs.nwu.
Reply-To : hpa@nwu.edu (H. Peter Anvin)
Subject : Re: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer

In article <1993Jul18.220944.106865@locus.com> of rec.radio.amateur.policy,
dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>
> Oh, goodness. The original poster suggested a single PC could be
> used to administer the amateur callsign database. He said nothing
> about how that PC is configured, nothing about the use of a network,
> etc. Why don't you give him the benefit of the doubt and save the
> flames ;-)?
>

Especially if that PC is running something like Linux. I am right now working on a 486 PC with Linux configured to use X-windows; it could support about 32 terminals (serial) without any major problems, especially if it is I/O centered.

/hpa

--
INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu
VOICENET: +1 708 475 6452 IBM MAIL: 36073 at IBMX400
HAM RADIO: N9ITP, SM4TKN NeXTMAIL: hpa@speedy.acns.nwu.edu
ANMDRKNING: Brev pe svenska dr hvgst uppskattade!

Date: 20 Jul 1993 02:06:26 -0400
From: digex.com!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22ar7e\$km9@access.digex.net>, <743039810snx@londonel.demon.co.uk>, <22dsa9\$214@sun1.clark.net>
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

andy@clark.net (Andrew M. Cohn) writes:
>Knowing that it is OK to order PIZZA via autopatch, the NEXT debate will
>be whether it's also OK to order a burger and fries instead. ; > K4ADL

Is it legal to autopatch your physician to ask if
a burger and fries are OK to eat?

High cholesterol and all that...

--
bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)
WARNING: You are subject to pre-emption!

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #240
